

Appln. No. 10/689,393

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1881

III. Amendments to the Drawings

Five replacement sheets of drawings are attached, which include amendments to FIGS. 3, 4 and 6, and new FIG. 7 has been added.

BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
& LIONE

-7-

Appln. No. 10/689,393

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1881

IV. Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed August 4, 2005, kindly enter the foregoing amendment and consider the following remarks. Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.112, Applicant(s) request reconsideration of each and every ground of rejection set forth in the Office Action.

The Office Action and the references cited therein have been carefully considered. In this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9 and 12 have been amended. Thus claims 1-17 are pending and are at issue herein. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration of this application is requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Taking the Office Action's objections in turn, the Applicants have added a new FIG. 7 to illustrate gripping teeth as recited in claim 10. Claim 12 has been amended, and the Applicants submit the objection thereto is moot in view of these amendments. FIG. 3 has been amended to include a cross-sectional cut line. Finally, FIGS. 4 and 6 have been amended to show the boss 25, and FIG. 6 now shows a latch 52.

For all these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Jensen reference (U.S. Pat. No. 4,571,888). As best seen in FIGS. 4-7 of the Jensen reference, Jensen discloses a three-sided channel 39 to which an extension portion has been added, namely a bent metal member 50 which is shaped around a plastic insert 49 used for engagement.

Unlike the Jensen reference, claim 1 recites that the three-sided channel has side walls and the cam moves through an aperture defined in the handle to selectively engage the side wall of the rail. Thus, while claim 1 recites a structure which engages the channel side wall itself, the Jensen reference requires the entire

-8-

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
ALIONE

Appln. No. 10/689,393

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1881

additional sheet metal structure 50 as well as molding of the plastic insert 49 and steps to interconnect the two structures. Thus, claim 1 eliminates several components of the Jensen reference and improves manufacturability by removing several additional steps.

Claim 1 also recites that the handle is spaced from the moveable panel to define a recess between the handle and the moveable panel receiving the engagement side wall of the rail channel. According to the Office Action, the recess defined by the Jensen reference is the portion to the left of teeth 48 and 49 as seen in FIG. 5. However, this recess does not receive the engagement side wall of the rail as recited in the claims.

Claim 1 also recites an aperture defined in the handle in communication with the recess. This allows the cam to move through the aperture and selectively engage the engagement side wall of the rail channel. While parts 44, 45 and 56 of the Jensen reference may form an open area which allows the arm 46 to rotate, the Jensen reference does not disclose an aperture through which the cam extends to selectively engage the rail channel.

For all these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims.

The Applicants also direct the Examiner's attention dependent claim 3, which recites that the cam is pivotally mounted to the handle and pivots about a pivot axis that is parallel to a plane defined by the moveable panel. Clearly, this structure is not shown in the Jensen reference. This difference also relates back to the cam extending through an aperture defined in the handle to directly engage the rail channel, which results in a operable structure that is easier to operate while protecting the handle and minimizing the profile (i.e. horizontal thickness) of the assembly.

The Applicants also direct the Examiner's attention to dependent claim 6, which recites that the distal end of the cam is curved and extends outwardly away from the moveable panel. Amended claim 8 further recites that the opposing sides of the handle includes flanges extending away from the moveable panel a distance greater than the distance the handle projects away from the rail in the locked position. Lastly, claim 9 recites that the engagement side wall of the rail is flat. As

BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
ALONE

Appl. No. 10/689,393

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1881

noted above, the Jensen reference requires a special plastic insert 49 having gripping teeth 48, which is clearly not a flat structure.

For all the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of the claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the specification is in order and that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal contact would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Attorney of the Applicants at the earliest convenience of the Examiner.

11/1/05
Date

Respectfully submitted,

Michael N. Spink
Michael N. Spink (Reg. No. 47,107)

Attachment: Replacement Sheets of Drawings

BRINKS
HOFFER
DILSON
SLONE